

CABINET AGENDA



Wednesday 12th April 2006

at 2:30 p.m.

in Committee Room B

MEMBERS: CABINET:

The Mayor, Stuart Drummond

Councillors Fortune, Hill, Jackson, Payne and R Waller

Also invited: Councillor James

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS

3. MINUTES

- 3.1 To receive the Record of Decision in respect of the meeting held on 29th March, 2006 (*to be circulated*)

4. BUDGET AND POLICY FRAMEWORK

- 4.1 Joint Waste And Minerals Local Development Framework - *The Director of Regeneration and Planning Services*

5. KEY DECISIONS

- 5.1 Public Conveniences – *Director of Neighbourhood Services*
5.2 Alternate Weekly Collections – *Director of Neighbourhood Services*

6. OTHER ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

- 6.1 2005/2006 Outturn Strategy – *Chief Financial Officer*

7. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

- 7.1 None

8. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

- 8.1 None

9. REPORTS FROM OVERVIEW OF SCRUTINY FORUMS

- 9.1 Final Report – Second and Third Tier Officer Salary and Grading Review - To be presented by the Councillor James, Chair of Scrutiny Coordinating Committee

EXEMPT ITEMS

Under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraphs referred to below of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985

10. EXEMPT KEY DECISIONS

- 10.1 Equal Pay – *Chief Personnel Services Officer, Chief Solicitor and Chief Financial Officer* (paras 3 and 5)
10.2 Tees Valley and South Durham NHS Lift Project – Town Centre Site – *Director of Neighbourhood Services* (para 3)

11. OTHER EXEMPT ITEMS REQUIRING DECISION

- 11.1 None

CABINET REPORT

12 April 2006



Report of: The Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

Subject: JOINT WASTE AND MINERALS LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

This item deals with the preparation of a joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework by the Joint Strategy Unit, on behalf of Darlington, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees Borough Councils.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Under the new planning system, unitary authorities are required to prepare minerals and waste development plan documents (DPDs). As government advice encourages joint working among local planning authorities where appropriate, it is therefore suggested that the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit (JSU) coordinate the preparation of this work on behalf of the five unitary Tees Valley Authorities. There is a need to prepare two DPDs – a core strategy and a site allocations DPD. These will comprise a separate Joint Local Development Framework (LDF) relating to minerals and waste.

Owing to the specialist nature of the subjects, it is proposed that consultants are engaged to assist with the preparation of the minerals and waste development plan documents with the costs split between the five Tees Valley authorities and over the plan preparation period (2006/07 to 2010/11).

It is suggested that the JSU has the remit to carry out all the processes and procedures involved in the preparation process, with the exception of the adoption of the final Core Strategy and Site Allocation development plan documents. Each individual authority will be responsible for the adoption of the documents.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

The Joint Local Development Framework is of strategic significance to the Council, setting out the policies and proposals for development and use of land in relation to waste and minerals matters.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

The Waste and Minerals Local Development Framework is part of the plans and strategies which together comprise the development plan and is part of the Council's budget and policy framework.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet – 12 April 2006.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

That the content of the report is noted, and that Cabinet endorses the principle of the Joint Strategy Committee taking responsibility for the initial preparation of a Joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework on behalf of Hartlepool Borough Council and the other four unitary Tees Valley Authorities.

Report of: The Director of Regeneration and Planning Services

**Subject: JOINT WASTE AND MINERALS LOCAL
DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. This item deals with the preparation of a joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework by the Joint Strategy Unit, on behalf of Darlington, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Redcar and Cleveland and Stockton-on-Tees Borough Councils.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The new planning system includes a requirement that unitary authorities should produce Development Plan Documents (DPDs) setting out policies relating to minerals and waste issues. The government is urging all waste planning authorities to prepare planning documents bringing forward new waste facilities to meet European Union obligations. Whilst the Hartlepool Local Plan does include policies for waste these do not satisfy all the European requirements.
- 2.2. The new planning system encourages planning authorities to work together to produce joint local development documents where appropriate. It is considered appropriate therefore to prepare, in conjunction with the other Tees Valley authorities, joint development plan documents on minerals and waste for the following reasons:
- the former Cleveland authorities currently operate together for the disposal of waste, and Darlington's arrangements for waste disposal with Durham County Council are soon to be terminated;
 - minerals resources in the Tees Valley area are limited to the extent that it is impracticable to prepare meaningful policies for the individual districts.

3. THE PROPOSAL

- 3.1. As the Tees Valley Borough Councils are at different stages of preparing new Local Development Documents under the new planning system, it will be necessary to prepare a separate Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework (LDF) which will comprise:
- A Core Strategy DPD which will contain measurable objectives and may identify areas of search for new development. The Core Strategy will be in conformity with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy for the North East

- A Minerals and Waste DPD which will identify and assess specific sites for future development, and will contain detailed development plan policies for assessing minerals or waste planning applications in the Tees Valley. This will be in conformity with the above Core Strategy.
- 3.2. The Minerals and Waste DPD will be subject to a sustainability appraisal, and the Hartlepool LDF Annual Monitoring Report will assess the success (or otherwise) of the strategy and policies.
- 3.3. Joint working arrangements were set up for the preparation of the adopted Tees Valley Structure Plan, and it is suggested that there is a similar arrangement for the preparation of the Minerals and Waste DPD. It is thus proposed that:
- the Tees Valley Joint Strategic Unit (JSU) will manage the project;
 - the JSU will be responsible for the preparation of most of the documents in draft, to be considered by officers of the respective authorities;
 - results of consultation will be reported back to the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee and to each local authority;
 - final draft documents at each stage will be considered by the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee before being endorsed by each local authority;
 - adoption of the development plan documents will be undertaken by each local authority, following presentation to the Tees Valley Joint Strategy Committee.
- 3.4. It is proposed to engage consultants to assist with the preparation of the Minerals and Waste LDF. The role of the consultants will be to identify and assess individual sites (including Environmental Impact Assessments), to assist with the sustainability appraisal process and to provide expert opinion at the independent examinations.

4. COSTS

- 4.1. It is estimated that the total costs involved in progressing the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD to adoption will be in the region of £165,000. This figure is only a guide until tenders are received.
- 4.2. The distribution of costs between the Boroughs is yet to be decided. However, if for example, the costs were split based on a population pro-rata basis, Hartlepool's contribution would be in the order of £30,000. An alternative might be to distribute the costs between the Boroughs to reflect the number of sites in each authority, or to derive a "hybrid" costing system which combines the "population" basis with the "site" basis. The costs would be spread over the financial years 2006/07 to 2010/11. Such costs could be met from the existing departmental Local Development Framework budget.

5. PROPOSED TIMETABLE

5.1. The indicative timetable at the present time is as follows.

Initial Processes:

- Appointment of consultants August 2006
- Commencement of work September 2006

Core Strategy and Site Allocations Development Plan Document Preparation

- Issues and Options Reports consultation May/June 2007
- Preferred Options Reports consultation Feb./March 2008
- Preparation of Submission Documents April 2008 onwards
- Submission of DPDs to GONE January 2009
- Pre Examination Meeting May 2009
- Independent Examination July 2009
- Receipt of Inspector's report January 2010
- Adoption April 2010.

Once the timetable has been finalised the Hartlepool Local Development Scheme will need to be amended to include the proposal to prepare a Joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework.

6. ADVANTAGES

6.1. The advantages of the Joint Strategy Unit preparing Tees Valley wide Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents are as follows

- economies of scale,
- a joined-up approach to a sub-regional issue,
- frees up Council staff to concentrate on the preparation of other development plan documents,
- will coordinate with the revised Waste Management Strategy, also being produced by the Joint Strategy Unit.

7. OFFICER ADVICE

7.1. That the content of this report is noted, and that Cabinet endorses the principle of the Joint Strategy Committee taking responsibility for the preparation of a Joint Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework on behalf of Hartlepool Borough Council and the other four unitary Tees Valley Authorities.

CABINET REPORT

12 April 2006



Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: PUBLIC CONVENIENCES

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To provide information to Members to enable them to formulate a policy in respect of public convenience provision.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

A comprehensive, detailed analysis of all public conveniences throughout the Borough, with recommendations regarding their future and proposals to invest in new facilities.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

This is a matter that affects all the population of Hartlepool and visitors.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Key decision (tests (i) and (ii) apply).

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet on 12 April 2006.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

To determine a policy in respect of public convenience provision throughout the Borough in light of recommendations contained within the report.

Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: PUBLIC CONVENIENCES

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To provide information to members to enable them to formulate a policy in respect of public convenience provision.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 It is fair to say that over a long period of time the Council has not developed a sustainable policy in respect of public conveniences and, following officer recommendations, has determined, in the main, various closures with the occasional new facility being provided.

- 2.2 Various departments of the Council have, at one time or another, been given the responsibility of managing public conveniences and in 2003 Neighbourhood Services took over responsibility for public conveniences not associated with parks or the Historic Quay.

- 2.3 The current budget for public conveniences is £110K made up as follows:

	£
Wages for Clock Tower attendants	55K
Mobile attendant	20K
York Road contract	13K
Repairs and maintenance	22K

- 2.4 As members are aware, the York Road facility has been removed but, as the contract still had several years to run, there was no saving in 2005/06.
- 2.5 Because of the condition of the toilets the annual repair bill always exceeds the budget and, therefore, there is always an overspend.
- 2.6 In general, due to low budget provision, the buildings and service have not been maintained to the appropriate standards.
- 2.7 As a result, the condition of the buildings, the equipment, and the service in general, has deteriorated over the years to such an extent that facilities in some sites have had to be restricted, minimised or closed.

- 2.8 However, due to the prolonged inadequate maintenance and the ever-increasing vandalism, even the reduced service cannot be maintained using the current resources.
- 2.9 One of the greatest problems common to all facilities is the problem of vandalism and anti-social behaviour. This problem is of a lesser extent at the Clock Tower due to the presence of attendants. However, even here recent acts of anti-social behaviour are a major cause of concern.
- 2.10 Only the facilities at the Lighthouse, Middlegate, Albert Street car park, and the Clock Tower sites, provide disabled persons facilities. These, however, are below the required standards, particularly at the Clock Tower. None of the facilities provide adequate baby changing facilities.
- 2.11 The facilities at Thorpe Street, Pilot Pier and Seaton Baths are not connected to the main drainage system due to their low level or the absence of a drainage system in their locality. Thorpe Street is connected to a septic tank, the Pilot Pier and Seaton Baths sites are connected to cesspits. Northumbria Water is responsible for the Pilot Pier cesspit, while the Council is responsible for emptying of the cesspit at Seaton Baths. All other facilities are connected to the main drainage system.
- 2.12 It is estimated that a realistic annual maintenance figure would be £50K which would allow for reactive and planned maintenance.
- 2.13 Viewpoint 1000 Survey

The latest survey showed the following results:-

- (a) Nearly half of all respondents had not used any Council owned public conveniences in the last 12 months
- (b) Of the respondents who expressed an opinion over 70% felt that there should be more Council owned conveniences across the town
- (c) Nearly a third of Viewpoint 1000 members who had used the Council owned conveniences said that the condition and standard was poor
- (d) 60% of Viewpoint 1000 members felt that the Council should commit more financial resources to improve the standard or the number of public conveniences

2.14 Parks, Historic Quay and Cemeteries

In the parks there are public conveniences in Ward Jackson, Seaton, Rossmere and Burn Valley. In addition, Adult & Community Services are also responsible for the Hartlepool Maritime Experience toilets. Neighbourhood Services is responsible for the facilities at Stranton and West View Cemeteries.

2.15 Current condition of all public conveniences

The provision of public conveniences in each of the Forum Areas is as follows:

In the North there are five sets of toilets: Thorpe Street, the Lighthouse, the Pilot Pier, Middlegate Bus Station and West View Cemetery.

In the Central Forum area there is the public convenience in the Albert Street car park, together with facilities in Ward Jackson, Burn Valley, Stranton Cemetery and the Hartlepool Maritime Experience.

In the South there are five current facilities: the former baths site, the Clock Tower, the Rocket House, Seaton Park and Rossmere Park.

3. **NORTH FORUM AREA**

3.1 Thorpe Street and Pilot Pier:

The condition of the facilities at the Thorpe Street and Pilot Pier sites is extremely poor, therefore their immediate closure is proposed. Part of the closure would consist of disconnection of services and the bricking up of the doors and window openings.

3.2 Middlegate:

The condition of the Middlegate facilities is moderate to poor, nevertheless, with adequate maintenance resources they could have remained. However, now the decision has been made in respect of the Town Square development, the toilets have been closed. New facilities are being provided as part of the Town Square Scheme.

3.3 Lighthouse (Heugh Battery):

The condition of the Lighthouse (Heugh Battery) facilities is moderate to reasonable, although essential maintenance, some upgrading and refurbishment work is required. The facility has hand-washing and disabled facilities.

3.4 West View Cemetery:

The condition of the facilities is poor and very basic, although they are currently functional, and in need of maintenance.

It is recommended that the current arrangements continue. It is also recommended that essential maintenance be carried out to bring the facilities to the required standards, and for provisions to be made for adequate future maintenance.

Consideration needs to be given to the long-term level and extent of the service.

4. CENTRAL FORUM AREA

4.1 Albert Street car park:

The condition of the facilities at Albert Street car park is of moderate standard, although essential maintenance and upgrading is required. In addition, these facilities have seen acts of anti-social behaviour and staff are constantly removing hypodermic needles from within the block.

In addition the land upon which the facility stands is the subject of discussions with the College of Further Education with a view to disposal of the site.

4.2 Ward Jackson Park:

These facilities are both male and female, without hand-washing facilities or disabled person facilities.

Whilst still operational, the overall condition of the building and the fixtures and fittings is poor.

4.3 Burn Valley Gardens:

There are two sets of conveniences in Burn Valley, upper and lower.

The upper facility is closed and has been for a number of years. The main reasons being the high costs of vandalism and serious anti-social behaviour. Users of the gardens and nearby residents also requested closure.

The condition of the fabric of the building is extremely poor.

The use of the lower facility is restricted to users of the bowling green and club members. Therefore the facilities are only used during the outdoor bowling season.

The facilities are without hand-washing or disabled facilities and are restricted to male use as the female toilet is used for storage.

The condition of the building and facilities is very poor.

4.4 Stranton Cemetery:

The main public conveniences are situated within the crematorium building. There is also an external open roof structure housing a urinal, near the crematorium at the centre of the cemetery.

The condition of the facilities at the crematorium is reasonably good, although the facilities would benefit from some essential maintenance and improvements.

4.5 Hartlepool Maritime Experience:

These facilities are greatly under-used. They only open during Easter and August Bank Holidays when there is a fair in the car park, the two days of the Maritime Festival and, occasionally, when other special events take place.

The building is designed to be manned by an attendant and the number of cubicles is high compared to modern anti-vandal public conveniences. There are disabled and hand-washing facilities but no baby changing facility.

Although the building is relatively new, the overall condition of the building shows signs of prolonged neglect and lack of adequate maintenance.

As a result, a considerable number of the building elements, equipment, fixtures and fittings are in extremely poor condition and many would need replacing.

The roof has a number of open holes. Roof tiles are missing and many are loose. It also appears that the roof has no roof tile underfelt.

There are numerous cracks to walls, which suggest movement and settlement.

A number of windows are heavily decayed and in need of extensive repairs or replacement. This is mainly due to lack of maintenance.

Many of the equipment, fixtures and fittings are in need of replacement. For example, the taps and soap dispensers need replacing due to the oxidation of the chrome finish and the corrosion of the metal parts.

There are signs of dampness to the walls due to roof leaks and rain penetration. As a result the plaster and wall paint is peeling off.

There has been no external painting since the building was built. As a result the external doors, handrails, windows and other external painted surfaces are in very poor condition and some may need replacing.

The frost protection heaters in the service duct also need replacing due to extensive corrosion.

5. SOUTH FORUM AREA

5.1 Former Baths Site - Seaton Carew:

There are both male and female facilities on this site with hand-washing facilities but no disabled or baby changing facility.

The general condition of the building and facilities is poor, with the roof being a particular cause for concern.

5.2 Clock Tower - Seaton Carew:

The condition of the facilities at the Clock Tower is moderate to poor. Although they are currently operational, nevertheless extensive and essential maintenance and refurbishment works are required.

Due to the building being listed, the extensive structural problems and the difficulties associated with split-level of the site, combined with the layout restrictions, create severe technical, economical and operational limitations. For these reasons the long-term viability of the facilities is questionable in their present layout and the current economic climate.

5.3 Rocket House - Seaton Carew:

The condition of the building and facilities is extremely poor and beyond economic repair. At the moment the facilities are not operational.

5.4 Seaton Carew Park:

For the last two years the public conveniences in Seaton Carew Park have been closed. This came about as a result of the continuous heavy vandalism, the high activity of anti-social behaviour and the installation of high level lockable security fence around the bowling club complex, thus creating a lockable enclosure.

As a result, access to the enclosure was restricted only to the members of the bowls club and the park's personnel.

It is worth noting that, since the new arrangements were introduced, the rate of vandalism and anti-social activities to the bowls pavilion complex were reduced by more than 95%.

Both disused/closed public conveniences (Gents and Ladies) are now used by the parks section as stores.

These end sections, forming the public conveniences, are in poorer condition than the centre section occupied by the bowling club.

The bowling club look after their part of the building well. They keep the site clean and tidy. They have decorated the internal of the building as well as the front external elevation. They also removed the window boards. In addition they have hung external flower baskets. Generally they have greatly enhanced and improved the outlook of the building.

Within the bowling club building there are separate toilet facilities for gents and ladies, however there are no disabled facilities.

5.5 Rossmere Park:

There are both ladies and gents provision but no disabled or hand-washing facilities.

At present the facilities are operational, however, the overall condition of the building and the fixtures and fittings is very poor.

6. OPERATION & MAINTENANCE

6.1 The daily operational management and cleaning of the public conveniences, not including those in the parks, is limited to 3 hours per day including travelling time.

6.2 Every morning, starting at 7.30 am, an operative attends each facility in turn and opens, cleans, fills up the soap and toilet paper dispensers, checks the facilities and reports any obvious defects. At about 3.00 pm the operative begins his round to close the facilities. This level of service is inadequate.

6.3 Apart from some very basic maintenance, e.g. replacement of toilet seats, etc, the facilities do not receive the required maintenance nor do they have a planned maintenance programme.

6.4 The parks facilities are usually opened/closed and cleaned by the parks operatives. Also the facilities are opened during the park's opening hours.

6.5 Attendants service:

Only the facilities at the Clock Tower has full-time attendants. There are two attendants, male and female

The facilities are usually open at 10.00 am until 7.00 pm (Wednesday 6.30 pm). There are some variations during the summer and school holidays

Lunchtime is 1.5 hours. During lunchtime there are no washing facilities as these are located in the attendant's room

7. COSTED OPTIONS

- 7.1 For public conveniences not associated with Parks - see **Appendices 1–3**.
- 7.2 For public conveniences associated with Parks - see **Appendices 4 and 5**.
- 7.3 For cemeteries - see **Appendix 6**.
- 7.4 Hartlepool Maritime Experience - see **Appendix 7**.

8. PROPOSALS

- 8.1 Close the Thorpe Street, Pilot Pier and Rocket House facilities and secure them in aesthetic materials.
Cost: £4,500
- 8.2 Build a new facility adjacent to the old Rocket House site and close the Clock Tower site.
Cost: £228,500
- 8.3 Carry out only essential maintenance to Clock Tower facility to keep them functioning until the new facilities are up and running.
Cost: £1,500
- 8.4 Refurbish and upgrade the Lighthouse (Heugh Battery) facilities.
Cost: £6,000
- 8.5 Consider what, if any, maintenance ought to take place to the Albert Street facility or whether it ought to be closed prior to any future land sale.
Cost: £8,000
- 8.6 Consider the building of a new facility at the former Seaton Baths site, with closure and demolition of the existing facility.
Cost: £233,000
- 8.7 Take no action in respect of the Seaton Park facilities other than essential maintenance. The new facilities at the Rocket House are in close proximity.
Cost: £5,000
- 8.8 Demolish and make good the site at the Ward Jackson Park facilities. The toilets at the café to be made available to all public during opening hours. Consider extending the café opening hours to accommodate need.
Cost: £6,000
- 8.9 Maintain and improve the facilities at Rossmere Park.
Cost: £50,000
- 8.10 Demolish and make good the site in the Upper Bum Valley.
Cost: £6,000

- 8.11 Maintain the Lower Burn Valley facility.
Cost: £10,000
- 8.12 Introduce adequate heating, together with routine and planned maintenance to the Stranton Cemetery main facility.
Cost: £5,000
- 8.13 Maintain existing facilities at West View Cemetery.
Cost: £1,500
- 8.14 Consider the options in respect of the Hartlepool Maritime Experience.
- 8.15 In the light of the increased revenue costs, it is recommended that this building be either completely refurbished to make it as anti-vandal proof as possible, or closed and marketed, or continue with its current limited use.
- 8.16 It is also recommended that all Council owned buildings should provide, wherever possible, toilet facilities for the public. In addition, town centre landlords need to be encouraged to make their facilities available to the public during normal, now extended, opening hours.
- 8.17 It is recommended that full consultation take place on these proposals, with the three Forums, the Headland Parish Council, resident associations, the access group and, if felt appropriate, the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum.

9. OVERALL COST OF PROPOSALS

- 9.1 £565,000 + £30,000 provisional sum, together with:

Hartlepool Maritime Experience options	£15,000 (Capital)
or	£100,000 - £200,000 (Capital)
plus added revenue costs of	£50,000

- 9.2 If the Cabinet decided to accept these recommendations, then the capital costs would total between £595,000 and £795,000.

The current revenue budget could be reduced by the cost of the two full-time employees at the Clock Tower and the refurbishment works funded through prudential borrowing and financed from this saving over a 20 year period.

At the lower end of the possible costs, this would leave some revenue to fund proper and adequate cleaning, as well as essential maintenance.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 Cabinet are asked to give their views on the options and proposals contained in the report.
- 10.2 Cabinet is recommended to approve that full consultation is undertaken on the options and proposals as described in paragraph 8.17.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Public Conveniences Condition Surveys Report - 2004
Public Conveniences Condition Surveys Report - Rocket House
Parks - Public Conveniences Report

Copies of which are available in the Members' Library

Letters relating to the termination of the Maintenance Agreement in relation to the
York Road APC

Appendix 1

Schedule showing estimated costs to:

- (a) Close the Thorpe Street, Pilot Pier and the Rocket House facilities
- (b) Carry out essential and backlog maintenance to the remainder of the facilities over the next 12 months, and bring these to the minimum acceptable standards

Estimated Costs:

Item	Site	Description of work	Cost
1	Thorpe Street	To close (mothball) the facilities	£1,500
2	Pilot Pier	To close (mothball) the facilities	£1,500
3	Rocket House	To close (mothball) the facilities	£1,500
4	Lighthouse (Heugh Battery)	Maintenance	£6000
5	Seaton Baths	Maintenance	£24,000
6	Clock Tower	Maintenance	£28,000
7	Provisional sums	Provisional sums	£1,500
8	Total		£64,000

Advantages:

- 1 Minimum maintenance costs
- 2 Minimum disruption during maintenance works
- 3 Early completion of works can be achieved
- 4 Brings facilities to the minimum acceptable standards
- 5 Provides breathing space to seek long-term solutions

Disadvantages:

- 1 Does not address the underlying problems
- 2 Does not provide for medium or long-term improvements
- 3 Does not address the access for disabled persons' requirements
- 4 Does not address the baby changing facilities requirements
- 5 In some cases it can be seen as wasted resources

Appendix 2

Schedule showing estimated costs to:

- (a) Close the Thorpe Street, Pilot Pier and Rocket House facilities
- (b) Carry out essential and backlog maintenance to the remainder of the facilities over the next 12 months and bring these to the minimum acceptable standards
- (c) Carry out some improvement work to Seaton Baths and Clock Tower, including the provision of disabled facilities at the Seaton Baths site

Estimated Costs:

Item	Site	Description of work	Cost
1	Thorpe Street	To close (mothball) the facilities	£1,500
2	Pilot Pier	To close (mothball) the facilities	£1,500
3	Rocket House	To close (mothball) the facilities	£5,000
4	Lighthouse (Heugh Battery)	Maintenance	£5,000
5	Albert Street Car Park	Maintenance	£7,000
6	Seaton Baths	Maintenance & Improvements	£70,000
7	Clock Tower	Maintenance & Improvements	£90,000
8	Total		£180,000

Advantages:

- 1 Relatively low maintenance costs
- 2 Acceptable level of disruption during maintenance works
- 3 Relatively early completion of works can be achieved
- 4 Addresses some of the highlighted problems
- 5 Improves and brings facilities up to more acceptable standards
- 6 Provides longer breathing space to seek long-term solutions

Disadvantages:

- 1 Does not address all the underlying problems
- 2 Does not provide long-term solution of the highlighted problems
- 3 Does not completely address the access for disabled persons requirements
- 4 Does not completely address the baby changing facilities requirements
- 5 Does not provide long-term solutions to some of the underlying problems
- 6 Spend may not provide value for money

Appendix 3

Schedule showing estimated costs to:

- (a) Close the Thorpe Street, Pilot Pier and Rocket House facilities
- (b) Carry out essential and backlog maintenance to the Lighthouse and Albert Street facilities subject to discussions with the College of Further Education
- (c) Demolish the facilities at Seaton Baths
- (d) Build two new facilities. One at Seaton Baths and a new one at the Seaton Carew front
- (e) Facilities at Seaton Baths to incorporate a new cesspit if the existing one is not suitable

Estimated Costs:

Item	Site	Description of work	Cost
1	Thorpe Street	To close (mothball) the facilities	£1,500
2	Pilot Pier	To close (mothball) the facilities	£1,500
3	Rocket House	To close (mothball) the facilities	£1,500
4	Lighthouse (Heugh Battery)	Maintenance	£6,000
5	Albert Street Car Park	Maintenance	£8,000
6	Seaton Baths	Demolish & Rebuild	£233,000
7	Clock Tower	To close (mothball) the facilities	£1,500
8	Seaton Carew front (Rocket House)	Rebuild new facilities	£227,000
9	Provisional sums	Provisional sums	£30,000
10	Total		£510,000

Advantages

- 1 Improves the service considerably
- 2 Acceptable level of disruptions during maintenance works
- 3 Addresses many of the highlighted problems
- 4 Improves and brings facilities up to more acceptable standards
- 5 Improves longer term solution
- 6 Provides better value for money

Disadvantages

- 1 Does not address all the underlying problems
- 2 Does not provide comprehensive long term solution of the highlighted problems
- 3 Does not completely address the baby changing facilities requirements

Appendix 4

Schedule showing estimated costs to:

- (a) Carry out repairs and limited improvement works at Rossmere Park, including the provision of basic facilities for the disabled
- (b) Carry out essential maintenance to the lower Burn Valley facilities
- (c) Carryout essential maintenance to the buildings at Seaton Park
- (d) Close (mothball) the facilities at Ward Jackson Park

Estimated Costs:

Item	Site	Description of work	Cost
1	Ward Jackson Park	To close (mothball) the facilities	£2,000
2	Seaton Carew Park	Building Maintenance	£5,000
3	Rossmere Park	Maintenance & Improvements	£31,000
4	Lower Burn Valley	Building Maintenance	£10,000
5	Upper Burn Valley	Keep building safe	£2,000
6	TOTAL		£50,000

Advantages:

- 1 Minimum maintenance costs
- 2 Minimum disruptions during maintenance works
- 3 Early completion of works can be achieved
- 4 Brings facilities to the minimum acceptable standards
- 5 Improves breathing space to seek long-term solutions

Disadvantages:

- 1 Does not address all the underlying problems
- 2 Does not provide long term improvements
- 3 In view of the solution being a short term one, it can be seen by some as wasted resource

Appendix 5

Schedule showing estimated costs to:

- (a) Carry out complete refurbishment works at Rossmere Park, including the provision of facilities for the disabled
- (b) Carry out essential maintenance to the lower Burn Valley facilities
- (c) Carry out essential maintenance to the buildings at Seaton Park
- (d) Demolish existing facilities and make good site at Ward Jackson Park and the upper Burn Valley

Estimated Costs:

Item	Site	Description of work	Cost
1	Ward Jackson Park	Demolish and make good site	£6,000
2	Seaton Carew Park	Building Maintenance	£5,000
3	Rossmere Park	Maintenance & Improvements	£50,000
4	Lower Burn Valley	Building Maintenance	£10,000
5	Upper Burn Valley	Demolish and make good site	£6,000
6	Provisional sums	Provisional sums	£3,000
7	TOTAL		£80,000

Advantages:

- 1 Relatively moderate maintenance costs
- 2 Acceptable level of disruptions during maintenance works
- 3 Relatively early completion of works can be achieved
- 4 Brings facilities to decent standards
- 5 Provides medium to long-term solutions
- 6 Provides better value for money in the long term

Disadvantages:

- 1 Does not address all problems
- 2 Due to the age and design of the buildings, further and higher maintenance costs than those associated with modern anti-vandal buildings, will continue to occur

Appendix 6

(i) West View Cemetery

- (a) To maintain existing facilities at their present level, with minimum reactive maintenance. Estimated required budget £1,500, and thereafter an annual maintenance budget of £1,500
- (b) To improve the existing facilities by adequate reactive maintenance, including the replacement of defective items. Estimated required budget £3,000 and, thereafter, an annual maintenance budget of £1,500
- (c) To build new facilities, incorporating disabled facilities. The estimated building costs are £30,000 - £50,000. An additional annual maintenance budget of £3,000 would be required

(ii) Stranton Cemetery

- (a) Repair roof, redecorate, carry out routine maintenance, point brickwork
Cost: £2,500
- (b) As above plus the introduction of heating and planned maintenance.
Cost: £4,500 - £7,500
- (c) Complete refurbishment and planned maintenance.
£7,500 - £9,500

Appendix 7.1

Hartlepool Maritime Experience

OPTION 1

To continue with the current arrangements.

Advantages:

None, apart from the minimum running costs

Disadvantages:

- 1 Extremely poor return on initial investment
- 2 Waste of valuable resources
- 3 Extremely poor public service
- 4 Further rapid deterioration of the condition of the building and fixtures and fittings would necessitate extensive and expensive repair costs

Costs:

Repairs	£10,000 - £15,000
Annual Maintenance Budget	£3,000

Appendix 7.2

OPTION 2

To carry out essential and appropriate maintenance to bring the existing facilities up to acceptable standards and to reopen them as regular public conveniences, with or without attendant service

Advantages:

- 1 Less expensive than the option of a complete refurbishment
- 2 Early completion with short term delays
- 3 **With attendant** - the attendant would provide a daily housekeeping service, on-hand assistance to users, friendlier service, minimise vandalism

Disadvantages:

(i) Without attendant service (**Not Recommended**)

- 1 Very short-term benefits
- 2 Potentially high risk of vandalism
- 3 High repair costs
- 4 Continuous vandalism
- 5 Difficult to match replaced fixtures and fittings, therefore poor appearance of facilities
- 6 Regular disruption to the service
- 7 High public perception of poor service

(ii) With attendant service - High wage bill and personnel problems

Costs:

Repairs	£10,000 - £15,000
Annual Maintenance Budget	£3,000
Attendant's wages	£50,000

Appendix 7.3

OPTION 3

To carry out complete refurbishment. This will include structural modification, the reduction of cubicles and the introduction of anti-vandal measures, and to reopen the facilities on a regular basis, as public convenience without attendant's service.

Advantages:

- 1 Almost completely new and modern facilities
- 2 As far as practicable the new facilities, incorporating anti-vandal properties, would minimise vandalism and significantly reduce repair costs
- 3 Offer of high quality service of public conveniences
- 4 Long term benefits and good return on proposed and past capital investment

Disadvantages:

- 1 High initial refurbishment costs

Note: It should be noted that any anti-vandal measures would only reduce the extent of vandalism. Taking into account the current high anti-social problem and phenomenon of vandalism, it is anticipated that vandalism would still continue to be a major problem and a drain on scarce resources.

Costs:

Refurbishment costs	£100,000 - £200,000
Annual maintenance budget	£5,000
Attendant's wages	£50,000

OPTION 4

Close the building as a public convenience and either use it for Council storage or market it.

Costs for mothballing	£2,000
-----------------------	--------

CABINET REPORT

12 April 2006



Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: ALTERNATE WEEKLY COLLECTIONS

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To recommend the introduction of an alternate weekly collection service to the whole of the town.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

To reduce landfill and meet statutory recycling targets, UK local authorities have introduced or are expanding voluntary kerbside collection schemes of recyclable materials. The success of such schemes is entirely dependent upon public participation and, whilst Hartlepool has achieved its 2005/06 targets, if we are to contribute towards the national targets of 30% plus, some challenging decisions lay ahead. An option being piloted in the South Forum Area is alternate recycling and residual waste collections. Residents have no option but to recycle - they continue to receive a weekly collection of waste; however recyclable materials are collected each week and residual every other week.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

It is a decision which may have a significant impact on communities throughout the town.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

Key decision (Tests (i) and (ii) apply).

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

Cabinet on 12th April 2006.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

Extend the alternate weekly collection scheme to the whole borough over the next 12-18 months.

Report of: Director of Neighbourhood Services

Subject: ALTERNATE WEEKLY COLLECTIONS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To recommend the introduction of the alternate weekly collection scheme to the whole of the town.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Refuse collection and waste disposal are services that the people regard as amongst the most important for the quality of their lives. A common mistake for many local authorities is the failure to recognise public attitude towards household waste. Recycling is about changing behaviour, it is not a one-off action; it is about adjusting and learning new habits. The benefits affect society as whole and not just individuals and, as such, the introduction of 'feel good' *voluntary* recycling initiatives will not enable local authorities to achieve stringent Government targets.
- 2.2 The Council provides an integrated waste management system whereby domestic refuse of all kinds is firstly reduced through conventional kerbside and bring recycling, home and community composting is encouraged and waste is separated for recycling and composting at the household waste recycling centre. Hartlepool Borough Council exceeded its 2005/06 target 12 months ahead of schedule with the help of LPSA funding and 19% of household waste is either recycled or composted
- 2.3 To reduce landfill and meet statutory recycling targets, Hartlepool introduced the voluntary kerbside collection schemes of recyclable materials in 2002 to include cans, glass and textiles. This alone is not sufficient to enable the authority to contribute towards the national recycling and composting targets of 30% and 33% set for 2010/11 and 2015/16 respectively. Surveys were carried out in January 2005 which showed, on average, 32% of all residents were participating in the scheme town-wide, ranging from 57% to 12%.
- 2.4 Marketing, education, and public awareness campaigns are fundamental during the implementation of any scheme; however, they are resource intensive and costly and, as such, cannot be viewed as a long-term strategy to change public behaviour towards recycling. Whilst we continue to provide a weekly 'collect all' service of domestic waste, there is very little incentive for the public to recycle.

- 2.5 Many authorities are now moving to a system of alternating general/recyclable collections to attempt to reduce overall levels of waste and to increase the percentages of recycling of waste. In January 2005 the Council authorised a pilot alternate weekly collection scheme on one refuse round covering 6,800 properties.
- 2.6 This report considers the implications of implementing alternate weekly collections of recyclable and residual domestic waste throughout the town. The report will assess current service provision with respect to refuse collection and kerbside recycling, comments on the differing waste collection practices currently in use across the UK, and concludes by recommending a suitable system complete with an implementation plan for elected members to consider.

3. **CONTEXT**

- 3.1 In 2000/01, 44,780 tonnes of municipal waste was generated within Hartlepool. By 2005/06, this figure is forecast to have increased to approximately 50,990 tonnes. This equates to a 25% increase within the space of five years. If the current rate continues, by 2025 the amount of municipal waste generated will be double that produced in the year 2000.
- 3.2 The Government's Waste Strategy 2000 sets local authority targets for recycling and composting household waste. For Hartlepool Borough Council the targets for recycling are 30% by 2010/11 and 33% by 2015/16 (N.B. the Government are reviewing these targets and they may increase to 45% and 50% respectively)
- 3.3 The Council entered into a recycling Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) to stretch its recycling performance even further (19% by March 2005) which it achieved.
- 3.4 The Council has been successful in introducing recycling initiatives into the lives of Hartlepool residents. The Civic Amenity Site was developed into a Household Waste Recycling Centre and a multi-material kerbside collection recycling scheme was introduced in 2002, funded through the DEFRA Waste Minimisation and Recycling fund.
- 3.5 The kerbside service operating town-wide is provided in-house and is receiving a high level of public satisfaction. In October 2003 resident satisfaction with the service was 84%.
- 3.6 Hartlepool Borough Council has two options to consider if it is to achieve the Government's recycling target of 30% by 2010/11:
- Negotiate with the waste disposal contractor regarding mechanical separation on the front end of the Energy from Waste Plant with a view to removing heavy inorganics i.e. metals and compostable materials; and

- Introduce alternate weekly collections of recycling materials and residual waste.
- 3.7 Negotiations with the Waste Disposal contractor, SITA, have commenced, however it is recognised that as this will be a lengthy process due to the number of partners involved, the planning process and the time required to construct the plant, therefore this option is outside the remit of this report.
- 3.8 The Council was also successful in receiving external funding to employ two Community Recycling Officers in 2005/06. The officers have been successful in developing strong links with the voluntary sector, resident groups and schools, educating and raising awareness with respect to waste disposal.
- 3.9 Approximately 9,000 subsidised compost bins have been distributed to households since 2001 and a communication/marketing scheme has been successful in encouraging individual participation on the multi-material kerbside service, which is slowly increasing participation rates, but more is required if we are to achieve our targets. Current participation in the recycling scheme is between 20-50% depending upon where you live. A waste audit, undertaken by MEL on behalf of the Tees Valley authorities, revealed that approximately 60% of resident household waste could be composted and/or recycled, 35% of which is garden and kitchen waste.
- 3.10 A recent survey undertaken of the voluntary kerbside recycling scheme showed that, of the residents who used the scheme, 89% were either satisfied or very satisfied with the service provided and 86% found the service easy to use. The majority of comments received linked to expanding the service so that more materials could be recycled.
- 3.11 Currently landfill tax per tonne is increasing by £3.00/te per annum and will continue to rise until it reaches £35.00/te, resulting in the tax costs being more than the actual cost of landfill. In 2006/07 it will cost £38.66 to landfill waste, incorporating £21.00 landfill tax, and approximately £29.00 for incineration.

4. **ALTERNATE WEEKLY COLLECTION PILOT SCHEME**

- 4.1 Contact with other local authorities that have introduced alternate collections, through telephone interviews and site visits, demonstrate that various options are available depending upon the receptacles used and whether waste is collected and sorted on the kerbside or collected commingled and segregated at a Materials Reclamation Facility (MRF). Councils that operate a dual bin service for garden and residual waste with a blue box for dry recyclables are the most efficient and effective in terms of service quality and cost effectiveness.

- 4.2 On 4th July 2005. Alternate Weekly Collections (AWC) were introduced to 6,800 properties within an area of Hartlepool. Until this point all properties within the town were served by a kerbside collection of glass, cans, paper and textiles, using a blue box and blue bag, provided free of charge to residents. This was a voluntary collection, every two weeks, with the green bin for domestic refuse collected every week.
- 4.3 The pilot area incorporates wide ranging housing types so as to be representative of Hartlepool overall and includes detached, semi-detached, terrace and link properties, flats and residential homes. These include privately owned properties, privately rented and those rented through Housing Hartlepool and other housing organisations.
- 4.4 All residents were provided with one brown 240L wheeled bin for their garden waste (140L was provided to those who requested a smaller version) and one white poly bag for plastic bottles and cardboard (residents could ask for up to 3 white bags). Residents who had misplaced their blue box or bag were provided with new.
- 4.5 The scheme started on a week where collections of the green refuse bin and blue recycling box and bag were made. The following week, the brown bin and white bag were collected. Collections continued like this throughout the six month trial period and are currently still in place.
- 4.6 Six weeks prior to the scheme beginning, information leaflets were sent to all residents within the pilot area informing them of when the scheme would begin, the containers they would be given, and a brief list of the materials that could be recycled.
- 4.7 This was followed up three weeks later with a more in depth leaflet of materials to be recycled, how the scheme would work and inviting residents to 'Question and Answer' sessions.
- 4.8 Doorsteppers visited all properties, ensuring residents were aware of the scheme and answering questions. For properties where nobody was present, a card was left explaining who had called and offering a telephone number to call and ask for another visit.
- 4.9 Customer care training was provided to those involved with the AWC and was specifically directed towards likely situations which might occur. All doorsteppers, administration staff, contracted collection crews and in-house crews who were to work with the pilot area, were present on the course.
- 4.10 To date, the recyclable tonnage collected from the kerbside in the pilot area has resulted in an increase from 7% to 15%. If we applied this scheme to all households in the borough we would expect to be recycling approximately 45% of all household waste collected. In a recent survey undertaken by the doorsteppers to residents, over 70% of residents said they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the level of ease of the scheme.

- 4.11 During 2005 the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum scrutinised the sustainability of environmental maintenance, including recycling and the pilot scheme. In December 2005 the Forum supported the continuation of the pilot in the south area of the town and recommended the further development and expansion of the scheme across the town. As such, this report proposes the dual bin scheme be available to all households in Hartlepool that have a garden, which is estimated to be approximately 32,000 households. Residents to be encouraged to take up the free home composting bin scheme as part of the Council's waste minimisation campaign.
- 4.12 Attached as **Appendix 1** are the minutes of the Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Forum held on 12 December 2005.
- 4.13 Residents not on the dual bin scheme, e.g. those properties without gardens, are only to be provided with a bag for plastic bottles and cardboard, enabling alternate collections to be provided across the town, and community composting in those areas encouraged.
- 4.14 Recyclable materials will be collected the same day as bin collection to avoid confusion for residents. As the Council has already provided residents with a wheeled bin and a blue box for recycling the only additional costs will be the capital outlay for the green waste wheeled bin and a second receptacle for dry recyclable materials.
- 4.15 The contentious issue can be customer relations as the removal of the existing service may seem a retrograde step to some members of the public. However, positive marketing with committed personnel and accurate communication has proved successful.
- 4.16 It is clear that Hartlepool Borough Council has some important decisions to make over the next few years, especially with respect to waste disposal. Stringent Government targets are already being reconsidered with a view to increasing the recycling standard of 40% by 2010 and 45% for 2015. Consideration has been given to continuing to provide a weekly refuse collection service as well as introducing cardboard, plastics and green waste collections; however this would double the costs and the scheme would continue to be voluntary. Recycling performance would not increase substantially and our CPA overall performance would not be sustained.
- 4.17 The conclusions of the pilot are:
- The most feasible and cost effective method of operating a dual bin scheme would be to use the existing bin for residual waste and procure new bins for garden waste, and a container for plastic bottles and cardboard.
 - The second bin would be primarily used for garden waste, but there would be an option to also use it for food waste depending as and when legislation came into force and securing a suitable composting outlet.

- The multi-material scheme should expand to include plastic bottles and cardboard.
- The in-house service provider should continue to operate the bin collection rounds.
- A dedicated helpline be set up to deal with the volume of calls that will be received in the initial months of the scheme.
- Communication awareness officers (door steppers) are fundamental to the success of the scheme undertaking home visits informing residents of the scheme and help reduce any misunderstandings.
- Containers should be delivered one month in advance enabling residents to get used to the idea.

5. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Attached as **Appendix 2** is a financial breakdown showing:

- Capital start up costs
- Additional recycling costs
- Waste disposal savings

SUMMARY

	<u>2006/07</u>	<u>2007/08</u>
Additional recycling costs	£268,560	£422,317
Waste disposal savings	£273,292	£281,490
Funding Surplus (shortfall)	£4,732	(£140,827)

- 5.2 As Members will see, there is a funding gap in 2007/08 of £140,827. It is proposed to balance this by using the Waste Performance and Efficiency Grant of £93,000 for 2007/08 and selling a small element of our Landfill Allowance Trading permits to the value of £50,000.
- 5.3 At the moment LATS are being sold for £19.00 per tonne and at the end of 2006/07 we will have a surplus of LATS, which at that value would be sufficient to fund the shortfall.
- 5.4 Whilst the WPEG grant continues to 2007/08, there is no guarantee that it will continue thereafter. However, experience has shown that this type of grant regime rolls out year on year.
- 5.5 Nevertheless, the LATS regime is a 15 year programme and, at current prices, which will undoubtedly rise as the first cut-off date of 2009 arrives, there will be sufficient monies to fund any shortfall from 2007/08 onwards.
- 5.6 Members need to be aware, however, that the financial viability of extending recycling is dependant upon the continuation of current grant funding and the level of LATS income. As these cannot be guaranteed, there is a potential future financial risk to this project. However, this needs to be considered against the additional costs the Council will incur from future increases in landfill tax.

- 5.7 Landfill tax is set to rise by £3 per ton per annum until it reaches £35 per ton. Based on our current landfill tonnage of approximately 7,000 tons per annum, this will mean a year on year increase of £21,000, culminating in a total of £98,000 by 2010. This additional cost will continue thereafter.
- 5.8 The contract initially stipulated minimum tonnages to landfill, however, this was a seven year clause and no longer applies.

6. RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 That the alternative weekly collection scheme be rolled-out across the Borough over the next 12 to 18 months.

Appendix 1

NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES SCRUTINY FORUM

MINUTES

12th December 2005

33. Sustainability – Environmental Maintenance (*Head of Neighbourhood Management*)

The Head of Neighbourhood Management informed members on the progress of the alternate weekly collection pilot operating in the South Forum area.

In the Autumn of 2004 the Environment and Regeneration Scrutiny Forum had begun the sustainability enquiry covering Environmental Maintenance and Asset Management. The first phase covered the recycling and composting of household waste and it was recognised that work would be required to reach the 2010 government targets in these areas.

An appraisal of various methods to increase recycling was carried out during the summer of 2005 and officers recommended alternate weekly collections as the most economical. In July 2005 a pilot scheme began covering the Fens Ward, Greatham, Rossmere and parts of Rift House and Owton Manor. 6,800 residents received an additional brown bin, blue box and bag and a poly bag for the recycling/composting of garden waste, cans, glass, paper, plastic bottles and cardboard.

Details of the consultation programme carried out prior to implementation were given to members, along with the arrangements for the disposal of the various forms of waste.

The Head of Neighbourhood Management reported that the scheme had been well received by the vast majority of residents. The results of a questionnaire showed that on average residents were satisfied or very satisfied with the scheme. Problems had been experienced with Wynyard Mews but notices of prosecution had been served on these premises and the Environment Action Team was monitoring the situation.

Following consideration of the report the following issues were raised

1. Could batteries be recycled? The Head of Environmental Management explained these were not included in the scheme. It was felt that they should be included as it was dangerous for them to be thrown out with the

regular household rubbish. Particularly as people were being fined for not recycling less dangerous products.

2. As there were only four bins for six flats at Wynyard Mews how did officers know which residents were not recycling? The Head of Environmental Management informed members that there was a bin for each residence but only four would fit in the bin stall. To find out those residents who were at fault officers would examine the contents of the bins for addresses and other identification. The scheme was carried out with sympathy and empathy for people's problems and no one would be forced to do something they were unable to do but the Government were getting tough on this issue and this had to be considered. Members also queried why there were brown bins at Wynyard Mews when there was no grass but the Head of Environmental Management explained that there were some grassy areas and the older residents had asked for the brown bins to remain.
3. Would assistance be given to residents who were unable to perform the necessary recycling tasks? The Head of Environmental Management confirmed it would provided they contact the officers concerned.
4. How could people not adhering to a voluntary scheme be prosecuted? The Head of Environmental Management explained it had previously been a voluntary scheme but was now mandatory. People who did not put their rubbish in the appropriate receptacle could and would be fined.
5. Could the binmen be prosecuted? They would often leave bags of rubbish that had fallen off the lorry. The Head of Environmental Management felt this was unfair given the tight timescales they worked to. They were supposed to clean up after themselves.
6. What was being done about the more flimsy containers which tended to be knocked or blown over? The Head of Environmental Management reported a more robust version had been developed for future use.
7. What was the policy on side waste? Would rubbish outside of the designated containers be collected? The Head of Environmental Management said side waste would generally not be collected apart from during Bank Holiday periods. If residents had any side waste they could phone to make arrangements for its removal. The scheme was intended for waste minimisation and included various items but not everything was covered. Attention was also drawn to the Council's free bulky waste collection service which currently had a three week waiting list.

Members expressed their support of the recycling pilot scheme. Comments made included:

- I live in the area and was not happy at the start but now feel it is excellent
- Officers need praise for this. We consume too much and waste energy and resources. There is not enough planet to sustain the way we live now. We all have a personal responsibility. I support this 1,000%
- It has been proven the system works. If we don't listen we will have mountains of rubbish. We need to start as we mean to go on and protect the future. It's time to wake up to the 21st century

A member requested that the circumstances surrounding any future prosecutions be reported to the Forum. This was agreed.

Decision

That the views of those members of the public in attendance at the meeting be taken into consideration.

Appendix 2

Financial Proposal (Detail)**Table 1: Capital Start Up Costs**

Capital	2006/07
Funding agreed by council	£600,000
Purchase & distribution of wheeled bins (24,000 bins @ £17.00)	£408,000
Purchase & distribution of weighted poly bags (45,000 bags @ £1.74)	£78,300*
Purchase of blue boxes 15,000 boxes @ £2.50	£37,500
Marketing literature	£45,000*
Total start up costs	£568,800
Waste Performance & Efficiency Grant (Capital £88,802)	
Purchase of and distribution of 250 community containers for multiple occupancies/sheltered accommodation/flats @ £350	£87,500

* These items are shown within the start up cost, but in practise cannot be classified as capital expenditure. Therefore, these costs will need to be funded from revenue resources. The Chief Financial Officer has indicated that this can be achieved by managing the funding of the overall capital programme.

Table 2: Additional Recycling Costs

Revenue recycling increased costs	2006/07	2007/08
Additional cost of green waste disposal 2928 tonnes @ £20.00	£58,560	£60,317
Additional cost of cans, glass, paper waste disposal (town wide)	£20,000	£172,000
Additional cost of cans, glass, paper waste disposal (increase in price)		
Additional cost of trade waste round	£110,000	£110,000
Additional cost of two operatives	£50,000	£50,000
Additional cost of new refuse freighters	£30,000	£30,000
Total recycling cost increases	£268,560	£422,317

Table 3: Waste Disposal Savings

Revenue waste disposal savings	2006/07	2007/08
Increase in tonnage of green waste 2928 tonnes Increase in tonnage of cans, glass, paper 4286 tonnes Increase in tonnage of plastic & cardboard 1509 tonnes Total tonnes 8723		
Total annual decrease in waste disposal costs 8723 tonnes @ £31.33/tonne	£273,292	£281,490

CABINET REPORT

12th April, 2006



Report of: Chief Financial Officer

Subject: 2005/2006 OUTTURN STRATEGY

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To enable Members to finalise details of the 2005/2006 Outturn Strategy.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

- 2.1 The report provides details of the latest forecast outturn and informs Members that the underspend on corporate budgets is more favourable than previously anticipated. On the down side there are a number of additional commitments which need funding. After reflecting these items and the issues approved in the provisional outturn strategy, there is an uncommitted underspend of £0.484m. It is suggested that this amount be earmarked to partly finance unfunded Equal Pay costs.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

- 3.1 The report enables Cabinet to finalise the 2005/2006 Final Outturn Strategy it wishes to put forward to Council.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

- 4.1 Non Key

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

- 5.1 Council on 13th April, 2006.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

- 6.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:
- i) Note the report;
 - ii) Approves the proposals detailed in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 and refer these items to Council for approval;
 - iii) Authorise the Chief Financial Officer to complete the necessary accounting entries in relation to the HRA as detailed in paragraph 5.2.

Report of: Chief Financial Officer

Subject: 2005/2006 OUTTURN STRATEGY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To enable Members to finalise details of the 2005/2006 Outturn Strategy.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Details of the initial issue relating to the 2005/2006 Outturn Strategy were approved by Council on 16th February, 2006. This report indicated there will be a favourable variance on corporate budgets, mainly owing to interest income on the Council's reserves and cashflows. The Council will also receive a one-off backdated population grant adjustment in the current year in relation to the 2003/2004 financial year.
- 2.2 The report also identified a number of additional unbudgeted costs in 2005/2006. Council agreed to fund these amounts from the one-off resources available in 2005/2006 as follows:

**Available
Resources/
(Commitment)
£'000**

Available Resources

Underspend on Corporate Budget	714
2003/2004 Backdated Population Grant	<u>334</u>
	1,048

Commitments

2005/2006 Unavoidable Commitments

• Contribution towards cost of greater integration Between HBC and PCT (e.g. Director of Public Health)	(40)
• Bulky Waste Service	(20)
• Contributions towards Phase 2 Equal Pay Costs	(787)

Invest to Save Proposals

• Young People's Service	(30)
• Access to Learning (A2L)	(81)
• Broadband Implementation	<u>(90)</u>
	<u>0</u>

- 2.3 At your meeting on 27th February, 2006, Members were advised that the overall underspend would be greater than reported at the half year. A final figure could not be determined as a number of issues needed investigating. However, for planning purposes it was anticipated that the year-end underspend may be up to £1.4m. It was suggested that the uncommitted underspend be earmarked for the unfunded Equal Pay Costs, subject to a further report being submitted to Cabinet to address the final outturn.

3. LATEST POSITION

- 3.1 Detailed work to finalise the 2005/2006 budget has now begun, although a number of issues will not be resolved for several weeks and are dependent upon the receipt of information from other organisations. At this stage it is anticipated that the final underspend on corporate budgets is anticipated to be £1.85m, an increase of £0.45m on the previously reported figure which is owing to the following factors: -

£'000

- **Finalisation of Revenue Support Grant (RSG) in Respect of Supported Housing Investment Programme (SHIP) Capital Expenditure** 110

Previous reports have outlined the complexities of the funding arrangements for the SHIP Programme which arose from the ODPM's decision to pay the RSG to Stockton Borough Council who were acting as the co-ordinating authority for the SHIP Programme. However, as capital expenditure was incurred by individual authorities the 2005/2006 RSG grant needed to be paid over to each authority. This issue had been subjected to protracted discussions with ODPM. This issue has recently been satisfactorily resolved and the Council's share of the RSG has now been received. From 2006/2007 ODPM have incorporated this payment into each authorities main RSG allocation.

- **Centralised Estimates** 340

Following actions taken in the final quarter of 2005/2006 further savings in centralised estimates have been achieved by securing lower interest rates on borrowings. The Council have also benefited from investment income earned on the reserves and cashflows.

- 3.2 A number of additional commitments have also been identified and it is suggested that these items be funded from the underspend on corporate budgets as follows: -

- **National Graduate Development Trainee** 28

In 2005/2006 Members agreed to corporately fund the costs of employing a National Graduate Development Trainee. It is suggested that a provision be established to meet the year 2 costs of this position, which will be incurred in 2006/2007. It is also suggested that future placements be funded from existing salary budgets.

- **Sale of Shopping Centre Pension Liability** 70

The Council has previously achieved significant benefits from the sale of the Shopping Centre and its subsequent development, including a significant capital receipt and ongoing rental share. Teesside Pension Authority have recently determined that the costs in relation to the cessation valuation undertaken at the time of the initial sale have not been paid. Investigations are ongoing to determine whether the Council or the Shopping Centre owners are liable from this cost. However, owing to the complexity of the initial sale and subsequent sales of the Shopping Centre it is anticipated that it will be difficult to establish who is liable for this cost. It would therefore be prudent to make a provision for this potential liability when closing the 2005/2006 accounts.

- **Refuse Shuffle Service** 60

As a result of the phased implementation of revised recycling arrangements the Council has incurred additional costs in relation to the bulking up of refuse and related transport costs. In the current year these costs amount to £30,000. It is anticipated that these costs will continue during 2006/2007 until the new recycling arrangements are fully rolled out. It would therefore be prudent to make provision for these costs in the closure strategy.

- **Feasibility Work at the Friarage Manor House** 20

A request has been received from North Hartlepool Partnership for the Council to consider match funding a contribution of £20,000 made by them towards investigation and feasibility work in relation to the Friarage Manor House.

The Friarage Manor House is one of the key buildings identified for support through the Headland Townscape Heritage Initiative (THI). At a recent meeting with the THI Monitor, advice was given to the effect that the Heritage Lottery considers securing the restoration and re-use of the Friarage Manor House to be the main factor in determining the success or failure of the Headland THI scheme.

Work has been progressing for some time on trying to secure a restoration scheme for the Manor House in association with the development of the adjacent land, but complications surrounding land ownership and securing a viable use for the building have created difficulties in bringing a scheme to fruition. Recently, however, progress has been made in identifying the owners of the Manor House (a charitable trust which had been disbanded but is currently in the process of being reformed) and it is hoped that discussions with them will help to move matters forward.

In terms of securing a viable use, a study was recently completed by the North East Civic Trust with funding from SRB and the Architectural Heritage Fund to ascertain the works required to restore the building and to identify budget costs. In addition, a draft development brief has been prepared and recently approved by Cabinet, providing planning advice and guidance which will assist in the marketing of the building and the surrounding land. The site is allocated in the 2006 Local Plan for mixed-use development and could be suitable for various uses or combinations of uses such as residential, community or small scale office or commercial activities. There is also the potential for the site to accommodate some much needed public parking to relieve parking pressures in this part of the Headland.

There have recently been a number of suggestions and expressions of interest relating to the conversion of the building for various community uses. The North Hartlepool Partnership wishes to explore these potential schemes further and to test their viability. They have therefore agreed to provide up to £20,000 towards the cost of feasibility work, subject to the Council being able to match this sum. It would be advantageous to do this prior to formal marketing of the site.

In view of the need to progress matters as quickly as possible, given the time-limited nature of the THI resources, it would be useful to incorporate some archaeological survey work into the feasibility assessment

in order to provide additional information that can be fed into the marketing process. The cost of this would be contained within the above sum.

- **Stock Transfer Diseconomies of Scale**

140

The 2004/2005 budget includes a provision of £0.3m for Stock Transfer Diseconomies of Scale arising from the withdrawal of services by Housing Hartlepool. This amount will increase to £0.5m per annum for the three years 2006/2007 to 2008/2009 pending the achievement of permanent savings of £0.2m.

During 2004/2005 Housing Hartlepool have withdrawn services at a faster rate than anticipated and negotiated lower chargers for some other services. As a result the anticipated diseconomies of scale have increased at a faster rate and to a higher value than anticipated for 2004/2005 and total of £0.56m. This compares to a budget provision of £0.3m, resulting in a shortfall of £0.26m.

On a more positive note the Council received a Housing Subsidy grant payment in 2004/2005 of £0.12m. It was initially unclear if this amount could be retained by the Council, or would need to be repaid as the Council did not have a HRA in 2004/2005. We therefore took a prudent view and earmarked this amount as being repayable. However, following the completion of the audit of the final HRA subsidy claim it is unlikely that this amount will be repayable. Therefore it is suggested that this amount be earmarked to partly fund stock transfer diseconomies of scale.

 318

- 3.3 After reflecting the above commitments and the items previously approved by Council (detailed in paragraph 2.2.), the uncommitted corporate underspend is £0.484m. As previously indicated it is suggested that this amount be earmarked for the unfunded phase 2 Equal Pay costs. These payments cover the second payment to employees who signed up to the phase 1 settlement and cover the three years up to 31st March, 2007. If Members approve this proposal the remaining unfunded Equal Pay costs, based on current estimates, will be approximately £0.5m. These costs will not become payable until 2007/2008.

4. SEATON CAREW COASTAL PROTECTION – REPAIR OF STORM DAMAGE

- 4.1 Following the completion of significant coast protection capital works in the late 1990's it was determined that the revenue budget for emergency works could be reduced. It was recognised at that time that there would be occasions when the annual revenue budget would be insufficient to cover the cost of unexpected storm damage. It was therefore determined that this risk would be unwritten from the Council's General Revenue Reserves.
- 4.2 On 28th February, 2006, storm damage was caused to sea defences at Seaton Carew and the concrete steps to the beach were destroyed. Emergency works were completed to the sea defences in order to protect the remaining structure and arrangements are being made to replace the concrete steps. It is estimated that these works will cost £70,000 and Defra will make a contribution of £10,000. The Council will therefore need to fund £60,000 of these costs from General Fund Reserves.

5. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) ISSUES

- 5.1 Following the transfer of the Council's housing stock to Hartlepool Housing the HRA was effectively closed at the end of 2003/2004. However, for practical reasons the Government required all Councils to maintain their HRA for a further financial year following the stock transfer for Hartlepool this year was 2004/2005.
- 5.2 In addition, the Council has maintained the value of former HRA tenant's arrears and the associated HRA bad debts provision within its accounts. As it is now two years since the Council's housing stock was transferred it would be appropriate to write these items out of the statutory accounts. It is suggested that the Chief Financial Officer be authorised to complete the necessary accounting entries.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The report details proposals in relation to the issues to be addressed in finalising the 2005/2006 Outturn Strategy. Cabinet needs to consider these items to enable the final accounts to be finalised before the statutory deadline of 30th June, 2006.
- 6.2 The final outturn will not be known until the detailed work to close the 2005/2006 accounts has been completed. It is not anticipated that there will be any significant changes to the forecast outturn detailed in this report. However, if the position does change it is suggested that any additional resources be earmarked to assist manage the 2007/2008 budget.
- 6.3 Owing to the timing of Cabinet and Council this report has been issued for Council on the understanding that Cabinet will not finalise its proposals until its meeting on 12th April, 2006.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 It is recommended that Cabinet:

- i) Note the report;
- ii) Approves the proposals detailed in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 and refer these items to Council for approval;
- iii) Authorise the Chief Financial Officer to complete the necessary accounting entries in relation to the HRA as detailed in paragraph 5.2.

CABINET REPORT

12 April 2006



Report of: Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

Subject: FINAL REPORT – ‘SECOND AND THIRD TIER
OFFICER SALARY AND GRADING REVIEW’
SCRUTINY REFERRAL

SUMMARY

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To present the findings of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee following its consideration of the Second and Third Tier Officer Salary and Grading Review, referred by the Finance and Performance Management Portfolio Holder on 11 November 2006 to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee.

2. SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

- 2.1 The Final Report outlines the overall aim of the scrutiny enquiry, terms of reference, methods of investigation, findings, conclusions, and subsequent recommendations.

3. RELEVANCE TO CABINET

- 3.1 To provide the formal response of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee, to assist the Cabinet in reaching the final decision regarding salary levels for the Authority's Second and Third Tier Officers.

4. TYPE OF DECISION

- 4.1 This is a non-key decision.

5. DECISION MAKING ROUTE

- 5.1 This is an Executive function and Cabinet will make the decision.

6. DECISION(S) REQUIRED

- 6.1 The Cabinet is recommended to consider the content of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's Final Report, in advance of reaching their final decision regarding salary levels for the Authority's Second and Third Tier Officers.

Report of: Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

Subject: **FINAL REPORT – ‘SECOND AND THIRD TIER OFFICER SALARY AND GRADING REVIEW’ SCRUTINY REFERRAL**

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1** To inform the Cabinet that the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's Final Report into the Second and Third Tier Officer Salary and Grading Review Scrutiny Referral will be circulated to Members in advance of and for consideration during this meeting.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1** At a meeting of the of the Finance and Performance Management Portfolio held on 11 November 2005, it was agreed to refer the Second and Third Tier Officer Salary and Grading Review to the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee for consideration of the Employers Organisation's findings, to be completed within the prescribed timescale of 10 February 2006 (Minute 1 refers).
- 2.2** Subsequently, the prescribed timescale was later extended on two further occasions by the Finance and Performance Management Portfolio Holder to that of 7 April 2006 to allow consideration of additional information together with the revised Employers' Organisation's recommendations as part of the Scrutiny Referral (Minute 22 and 46 refers).
- 2.3** In accordance with the Authority's Access to Information Rules together with the prescribed timescale for the completion of this Scrutiny Referral, it has not been possible to include the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's Final Report within the statutory requirements for the despatch of the agenda and papers for this Cabinet meeting, as the Committee are to consider the revised recommendations of the Employers' Organisation at their meeting on 7 April 2006.

3. RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet notes the content of this report and considers the content of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee's Final Report into the Second and Third Tier Officer Salary and Grading Review, which will have been previously circulated under separate cover in advance of this meeting.

Contact Officer:- Charlotte Burnham – Scrutiny Manager
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 087
Email: charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

CABINET

12 April 2006



Report of: Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee

Subject: HOLDING RESPONSE – ‘SECOND AND THIRD
TIER OFFICER SALARY AND GRADING REVIEW’
SCRUTINY REFERRAL

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To inform the Cabinet of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee’s ‘holding’ response in relation to the Second and Third Tier Officer Salary and Grading Review Scrutiny Referral following the unavailability of the financial information on 7 April 2006.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2.1 In accordance with the Authority’s Access to Information Rules together with the prescribed timescale for the completion of this Scrutiny Referral, it has not been possible to include this report with the agenda and papers for this Cabinet meeting (in line with the statutory requirements), as the Committee were to consider the revised recommendations of the Employers’ Organisation at their last meeting held on Friday 7 April 2006.
- 2.2 Such consideration was given to the revisions made to the Employers’ Organisation’s recommendations at the meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee held on 7 April 2006. However, during the consideration of this item, the Committee agreed to defer their formal response to the Cabinet, on the basis that the information relating to the financial implications on departmental staffing budgets being made available to the Committee in June 2006.
- 2.3 Given the prescribed timescale for the undertaking of the Scrutiny Referral was that of the 12 April 2006, it will be necessary for the Cabinet to agree a further extension to the prescribed timescale for the undertaking of the Scrutiny Referral.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

3. RECOMMENDATION

3.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet:-

- (a) Notes that the Scrutiny Co-ordinating Committee are unable to present their formal response at this meeting in respect of the Second and Third Tier Officers Salary and Grading Review, in light of the outstanding financial information to be made available to the Committee during June 2006; and
- (b) That an extension to the prescribed timescale (currently 12 April 2006) for the undertaking of this Scrutiny Referral be determined.

Contact Officer:- Charlotte Burnham – Scrutiny Manager
Chief Executive's Department - Corporate Strategy
Hartlepool Borough Council
Tel: 01429 523 087
Email: charlotte.burnham@hartlepool.gov.uk

BACKGROUND PAPERS

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.